



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,794	12/04/2000	Roberto Trinca	4227/MS/CS	8992
466	7590	01/20/2004	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			ENG, GEORGE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	
DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/701,794	TRINCA, ROBERTO
	Examiner George Eng	Art Unit 2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 32-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 32-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed 10/16/2003 (paper no. 7).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 32-34, 36, and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafiee (US PAT. 6,124,880) in view of Mori (JP 08297624 A).

Regarding claim 32, Shafiee discloses a process for carrying out and managing video conferencing among a plurality of user locations (12, figure 2) comprising the steps of linking a direction room (20, figure 2) to the plurality of user locations (12, figure 2) from which audiovisual signals originate (col. 4 lines 4-19), converting the audiovisual signals from their respective signal formats to at least one transmission signal format before transmission of the audiovisual signals to the direction room and then transmitting the audiovisual signals from the user locations to the direction room using the at least one transmission signal format (col. 4 lines 20-47), converting all of the received audiovisual signals into a common audio video format prior to use the audiovisual signals at the direction room (col. 6 lines 14-37), selecting the

audiovisual signals in the common audio video format to send to the user locations employing an input audio video matrix (32, figure 1) at the direction room (col. 5 line 37 through col. 6 line 13) and converting the complete outgoing signals from the common audio video format to the at least one transmission signal format before transmission of the complete outgoing signals to the user locations and then transmitting the complete outgoing signals from the direction room to the user locations using the at least one transmission signal format (col. 6 line 38 through col. 7 line 21). Shafiee differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching the step of adding further information in the common audio video format to the selected audiovisual signals to form complete outgoing signals in the common audio video format. However, Mori teaches a multimedia video teleconferencing system to add information in the broadcast transmitted data in order to enhance process by providing additional information including characters, graphics, sounds and animations during the video conferencing (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shafiee in adding further information in the common audio video format to the selected audiovisual signals to form complete outgoing signals in the common audio video format, as per teaching of Mori, in order to enhance process by providing additional information including characters, graphics, sounds and animations during the video conferencing

Regarding claim 33, Mori teaches the further information including at least one of characters, graphics, sounds and animations (abstract).

Regarding claim 34, Shafiee teaches to select a first complete outgoing signal to a speaker at a videoconference and to select a second complete outgoing signal different from the

first complete outgoing signal for video attendees other than the speaker (col. 5 line 66 through col. 6 line 13).

Regarding claim 36, Mori teaches the speaker receiving graph and other participants receiving the graph and an image of the speaker (abstract).

Regarding claim 39, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 32.

Regarding claim 40, Shafiee teaches to convert digital audiovisual signal into analog audiovisual signal (col. 4 lines 20-24) so that it recognizes the first converting means comprising analog/digital audiovisual devices.

Regarding claim 41, Shafiee teaches the apparatus for carrying out and managing a videoconference among a plurality of user location comprising a mixer (col. 7 lines 8-21).

Regarding claim 42, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 43, it is old and notoriously well known in the art of adding a name of a speaker at a videoconference in order to make easy to identify the speaker.

Regarding claim 44, Shafiee discloses the means for selecting comprising a second video matrix that receives an input from the mixer (figure 1).

4. Claims 37 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafiee (US PAT. 6,124,880) in view of Mori (JP 08297624 A) as applied in claims above, and further in view of Champa (WO 98/23075 A2).

The combination of Shafiee and Mori differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a translation facility that translates speech in a signal from the user location and adds a translation of the speech to the outgoing signal. However, Champa teaches a multimedia video conferencing system including a plurality of signal processing functions comprising a translation module for translating speech signal and adding the translated speech signal for transmission in order to provide multimedia conferencing among a wide variety of sites (abstract and page 11 line 3 through page 12 line 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Shafiee and Mori in having the translation facility that translates speech in a signal from the user location and adds a translation of the speech to the outgoing signal, as per teaching of Champa, in order to provide multimedia conferencing among a wide variety of sites.

5. Claims 38 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafiee (US PAT. 6,124,880) in view of Mori (JP 08297624 A) as applied in claims above, and further in view of Bruno et al. (US PAT. 5,710,591 hereinafter Bruno).

The combination of Shafiee and Mori differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching to record the videoconference for an archive. However, Bruno teaches to record and index information exchanged during a multimedia conference comprising a computer functioned as a video tape recorder for recording video, audio and data information that is exchanged during a particular multimedia conference in order to enhance the conference control unit for subsequent retrieval and processing (abstract, col. 3 lines 19-40 and col. 4 line 44 through col. 5 line 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Shafiee and Mori in recording audio video signal for the purpose of archive, as per teaching of Bruno, because it enhances the conference control unit in provide subsequent retrieval and processing.

6. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shafiee (US PAT. 6,124,880) in view of Mori (JP 08297624 A) as applied in claims above, and further in view of Ishii et al. (JP 08251566 A hereinafter Ishii).

The combination of Shafiee and Mori differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching an intercom system for the user locations whose are not interested in following the videoconference. However, Ishii teaches a television conference device to improve the operability by providing an open mode and a private mode so that a user at a locate terminal is capable of communicating with a selected conferee to perform a private communication, i.e., intercom with the selected conferee, during a videoconference (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Shafiee and Mori in having the intercom system for the user locations whose are not interested in following the videoconference, as per teaching of Ishii, in order to improve the operability by providing the private mode during the videoconference.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 35 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim32-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Polomski (US PAT. 5,600,646) discloses a videoconferencing system having a multipoint control unit for allowing dissimilar audiovisual terminals to communicate with each other in a conference (abstract).

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Eng whose telephone number is 703-308-9555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A. Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-6306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



George Eng  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2643